

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 14-16, 18-20, 25, 26 and 29-32 remain pending in the present application. Claims 17 and 27 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 14, 18, 25 and 26 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 14-16, 18-20, 25, 26 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,642) in view of Schiff (U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,456). Claims 4 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas and Schiff in view of Thomas (U.S. Pat. No. 6,498,939). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas and Schiff in view of Tiedemann (U.S. Pat. No. 6,396,867). Claim 27 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 27 depended from Claim 25. Claim 25 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 27 and Claim 27 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 25, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 26 and 29-32, which depend from Claim 25, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to also include the limitations of Claim 27 and is thus believed to be allowable. Likewise, Claims 2 and 4-7, which depend from

Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 14 has been amended to also include the limitations of Claim 27 and is thus believed to be allowable. Likewise, Claims 15, 16 and 18-20, which depend from Claim 14, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claim 17 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 5, 2006

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg